

## REMARKS

This Response is submitted in reply to the final Office Action dated November 14, 2006, issued in connection with the above-identified application. A one-month extension of time, supplemental information disclosure statement and a request for continued examination (RCE) are submitted herewith. Claims 1-24 and 26-55 are pending in the present application. With this Response, the specification has been amended to add a section for Cross Reference to Related Applications; the abstract has been replaced; claims 1-24 and 26-55 have been canceled; and claims 56-75 have been added. No new matter has been introduced by this Response; thus, favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested. The Director is hereby authorized to charge deposit account 02-1818 for any fees which are due and owing.

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 2, 7, 9-16, 19, 24, 27-32, 34, 36-46, 49 and 51-55 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,312,507 to Taylor et al. ("Taylor"); and also rejects claims 3-6, 17-18, 20-23, 33 and 47-48 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) in view of Taylor. The Applicants respectfully disagree with and traverse these rejections.

Claim 1-24 and 26-55 have been canceled rendering the above claim rejections moot. Additionally, new claims 56-75 are patentably distinguished over Taylor. New independent claims 56, 66 and 72 are also patentably distinguished over Taylor.

New independent claim 56 recites "an air treatment device comprising:...at least one sensor operatively coupled to the voltage generator, the sensor having a light source and a light detector, the voltage generated by the voltage generator being adjusted based on a condition sensed by the sensor." Taylor does not anticipate the subject matter defined by claim 56.

New independent claim 66 recites "an air treatment device comprising:...at least one ozone sensor operatively coupled to the voltage generator, the ozone sensor being operable to produce a plurality of signals used for adjusting the voltage generated by the voltage generator." Although Taylor describes the use of high voltage pulses between electrode arrays to increase ozone production, Taylor does not anticipate the subject matter defined by claim 66.

New independent claim 72 recites "an air treatment device comprising... a processor operatively coupled to the ozone sensor and the voltage generator, the processor being operable

to adjust the voltage based on comparing a first signal representing a first ozone concentration to a second signal representing a second ozone concentration sensed by the ozone sensor.” Again, Taylor does not anticipate the subject matter defined by claim 72.

New independent claims 56, 66 and 72 are patentably distinguished over Taylor as well. Likewise, new dependent claims 57-65, 67-71 and 73-75 are patentably distinguished over Taylor based on their dependency from independent claims 56, 66 and 72. Moreover, new dependent claims 57-58, 60-61, 68, and 73 are also patentably distinguished over Taylor on their own merit.

Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request that the claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) and 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn. Moreover, the Applicants believe the application is in condition for allowance and kindly request favorable action on the merits.

As noted above, the Applicants have filed an RCE with this Response. Accordingly, the Applicants request that the Examiner provide an upcoming Office Action which will “...identify any claims which he or she judges, as presented recited, to be allowable and/or...suggest any way in which he or she considers that rejected claims may be amended to make them allowable” in accordance with MPEP §707.07(d).

The Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to contact the undersigned should the Examiner identify any issues that can be addressed over the telephone.

Respectfully submitted,

BELL, BOYD & LLOYD LLC

BY



Renato L. Smith  
Reg. No. 45,117  
Customer No. 29190

Dated: March 14, 2007